DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 711 SP 033 541

AUTHOR Parker, Franklin
TITLE U.S. Teacher Education Trends, 1990-92.
PUB DATE Jan 92
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Labor Turnover; Public Schools; *Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Persistence; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS America 2000; Goodlad (John I); Holmes Group; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ; National Education Goals 1990; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

Pressure to upgrade education standards, especially from the six national goals for U.S. education set forth in President Bush's America 2000 program, has affected teacher education. In addition, other pressure has come from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' plan to certify teachers nationally after 1993-94; the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, which accredits under half of the approximately 1,200 U.S. teacher education institutions; John I. Goodlad's teacher education reform plan which led to the creation of 8 pilot Centers of Pedagogy similar to the Holmes Group's (96 education deans at major research universities) Professional Development Schools. Other trends disscussed in the paper are: alternative teacher certification, the Teach for America program, teacher education reform, and teachers who leave teaching or remain in the public school system. (LL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED340711

Franklin Parker
School of Education and Psychology
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC 28723

January 10, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# U.S. Teacher Education Trends, 1990-92

by Franklin Parker

**Introduction.** In 1991-92 some 2.8 million U.S. elementary and secondary school teachers (2.5 million public; 0.4 million private) taught 46.8 million elementary and secondary school students (41.5 million public; 5.3 million private). Elementary and secondary school total expenditure was $248.6 billion ($229.4 billion public; $19.2 billion private), or $5,961 per student in average daily attendance. Public school teachers' average annual salary was $34,814 ($33,015, 1990-91).[1]

Pressure to upgrade education standards, especially from President Bush's America 2000 six national goals for U.S. education, greatly affected teacher education. Despite criticism from traditional teacher education groups, alternative teacher certification programs grew dramatically in all but two states (New York and North Dakota) with Teach for America a new and controversial program.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards advanced its post-1993-94 plan to certify teachers nationally after 1993-94 by contracting with research groups to develop tests to determine highest teacher qualifications in some 30 teaching areas. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, which accredits under half of the approximately 1,200 U.S. teacher education institutions, gained in Florida but was set back in West Virginia. John I. Goodlad's teacher education reform plan led to the creation of eight U.S. pilot Centers of Pedagogy, somewhat similar to the Holmes Group's (96 education deans at major research universities) Professional Development Schools, both of which bring together arts, sciences, and education professors, collaborating with public school personnel in teacher training centers to improve preparation of new and experienced teachers.

**Alternative Teacher Certification.** A 1991 report[2] lists 11 states with high caliber (Class A) alternative certification programs (8 of them in the last year); alternative, that is, to traditional college of

SP033 541

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Parker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education graduation plus state certification. Eight other states have such programs for certain teacher-short, or subject-short, or grade-short areas; 39 states say they have or are developing alternative certification programs; 16 states and the District of Columbia waive certification by permitting individuals to teach unsupervised while they take education courses; and two states (New York and North Dakota) are not considering any form of alternative certification. Since 1985, the report says, over 20,000 alternatively certified teachers have been licensed, with 12,000 additional ones entering in the last two years (a 120 percent increase from 1988-89 to 1990-91).[3]

Alternative routes to teaching are criticized by President Arthur E. Wise of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and others with vested interest in traditional teacher education college graduation before state certification. These critics say that provisionally certified teachers are insufficiently trained, are less effective than fully prepared teachers, are arts and science graduates who know their subjects but not how to teach it to students, and who become temporary teachers on the way to finding a "real" job. Critics add that lowering standards for alternative certification is wrong when the need is to strengthen traditional education college programs as the preferred route to teacher certification.[4]

Defenders say that alternative certification programs grew because too few traditionally prepared teachers take teaching jobs. In Wisconsin 70 percent and in Minnesota 68 percent of new teacher education graduates do not take teaching jobs, says University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Education Professor Martin Haberman, involved in alternative teacher certification programs for 30 years. Nationally, most teacher education graduates look for teaching jobs in wealthier suburban and small town schools, where they are not needed. They avoid harsh conditions in inner city and remote rural schools where they are needed. Half of the teacher education graduates who take teaching jobs where they are needed quit or fail within 3 years. Traditional teacher education program graduates, says Haberman, do not want to, and could not accommodate if they wanted to, all the children in U.S. school. Alternative certification is the only solution to the unalterable fact that many children must attend less than adequate schools where new teachers are loathe to go. Hence the growth of and approval of alternative certification programs by parents and a growing

number of teacher unions, school districts, and teacher-producing colleges and universities.

Alternatively certified teachers often succeed in harsh school settings where traditionally trained teachers fail, says Haberman, because they are carefully screened, are generally more mature, have a wider range of life experiences, are committed ideologically to teach where they are needed, many are minorities, and they want to salvage likely dropouts. Haberman's example is "that while traditionally trained teachers are fewer than 5 percent black, 58 percent of the alternative teachers of Texas are members of minorities."[5]

Haberman estimates that, if we employed teachers only from traditional training programs, some 12 million school children would be left with unqualified substitutes or with teachers in the process of failing. He estimates that this number grows at least 5 percent each year. The need is both to improve traditional teacher education and also to actively promote alternative certification, because the need is so great.

**Teach for America** (TFA), a publicized new alternative route to teaching, placed over 1,200 new and second year TFAers (495 selected in 1990; 750 in 1991) in teacher-short schools in New York City; Los Angeles and Oakland, CA; Houston, TX; New Orleans and Baton Rouge, LA; plus rural schools in Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, and the Texas Rio Grande Valley. TFAers are recruited from recent noneducation college graduates who then enroll in an intensive 8-week preservice summer teacher institute (6 weeks, University of Southern California lectures and student teaching in year-round Los Angeles public schools; plus 2 weeks pre-teaching orientation under mentors at schools where they will teach for two years). They do not displace fully certified teachers and are paid a first-year salary between $15,000-$29,000.[6] TFA founder Wendy Kopp, age 24, is a June 1989 Princeton University graduate. She sent her senior year sociology thesis on how she would organize TFA to corporate executives who supported her plan. She now runs a $5 million a year TFA recruitment-training-placement enterprise.

TFA critics, who prefer college education major graduates who become state-certified teachers, say that ghetto school children are short changed by TFAers' brief 8-weeks' training. They also fault the program's short two-year teaching commitment. Defending her alternative teacher plan, Kopp says she recruits bright and able arts and science graduates,

including minorities, who would ordinarily not become teachers, to serve in teacher-short ghetto and rural schools. Many TFAers will teach beyond two years, she says, some permanently; while those leaving for other careers become public school friends and supporters.[7]

Of 495 TFAers in 1990, 55 resigned by June 1991, an 11 percent attrition rate, slightly higher than the national rate for first-year teachers, but far lower than the 25 percent to 50 percent turnover in difficult schools where TFAers are placed. TFAers are sobered and disturbed by the poverty, violence, despair, and administrative resistance they meet. Many are struck by how hard it is to motivate children and to convince them that education counts. In their first tumultuous year TFAers encountered a New Orleans teacher strike and a New York City budget crisis that placed them under layoff threat.[8] So far, school administrators and mentors are pleased with what TFAers have accomplished in ghetto and rural schools.[9]

**National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).** The Bush administration first opposed but in 1991 began to favor federal aid to NBPTS, a private, nonprofit Carnegie-created (1987) 64-member organization which aims to identify and certify the nation's ablest teachers. The NBPTS seeks $50 million for research on tests that identify the best teacher standards in 30 teaching subject areas. Foundations gave $18 million, with $4.88 million more promised by the U.S. Education Department in 1990 but held up by Sen. Jesse Helms and other congressional conservatives. Conservatives fear that federal aid gives federal approval to a national teacher certification standard that would hurt private schools and home schoolers (NC Republican Sen. Helms is politically opposed to NBPTS's chair, former Democratic NC Gov. James B. Hunt).[10]

Teacher education groups also oppose NBPTS because higher paid NBPTS-certified teachers will place state certified-only teachers at the bottom of a 2-tier salary scale. Opposing teacher education groups also want to safeguard their long investment in teacher education college graduation plus state certification.

The NBPTS's national forum, June 23-25, 1991, saw indications that the stalled congressional $4.88 million would be released and that more federal funds might follow. NBPTS's Deputy Secretary David T. Kearns became Deputy U.S. Secretary of Education in spring 1991. Education

Secretary Lamar Alexander said in 1991, "I think it's in the national interest to support [the board]. I think the board can be a powerful voice for change." Support also came from leading choice advocate Dennis P. Doyle, Hudson Institute Senior Research Fellow and advisor to Education Secretary Alexander. National Education Association opposition also seems reduced.[11] NBPTS awarded three contracts in 1991 to research organizations (one research contract was awarded in 1990) to design rigorous performance-based tests to identify superior teachers. Teachers who apply to take and then pass these tests from 1993-94 onward will become NBPTS-certified teachers, hopefully earn public esteem by being certified as the ablest teachers, and be professionally paid and respected.[12]

**National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).** NCATE, which accredits fewer than half of the 1,200 U.S. teacher education institutions, gained in Florida but had a setback in West Virginia in 1991. Florida's teacher education institutions were accredited by either the Florida education department, or the state board of regents, or NCATE, each with somewhat different standards. An early October 1991 agreement allowed the three organizations to accredit teacher education institutions jointly, using one standard. The Florida agreement was seen as a step toward similar pacts in other states leading to possible national teacher education accreditation.[13]

But also in October 1991, West Virginia changed its requirement that all teacher education institutions, public and private, be NCATE-accredited. Under a new plan West Virginia teacher education institutions can be accredited by either NCATE or by new state standards yet to be developed. In dispute is the motive of the West Virginia Board of Education, which made the decision. Some observers say that the Board bowed to West Virginia institutions unable to meet NCATE standards. The chancellor of the West Virginia University system said that those institutions would continue to seek NCATE accreditation.[14]

**Teachers Who Stay, Move, or Leave.** An August 1991 federal report says that 5.6 percent of teachers in public schools (over 130,000) and 12.7 percent in private schools (40,000) left teaching between 1987 and 1989.[15] More younger and older teachers left than did middle career teachers. Science and math teachers left at the same rate as did teachers in other fields. Of public school teacher-leavers, 27.2 percent left to be homemakers or rear children and 24.8 percent retired. Of private school

teacher-leavers, 30 percent left to be homemakers or rear children and 35 percent moved to jobs outside of elementary and secondary schools. Of those public school teachers who left teaching because they were dissatisfied, 7.3 percent cited poor salary while 26.4 percent cited inadequate administrative support; 16 percent of private school teachers cited poor salaries as their reason for leaving teaching.

**Teacher Education Reform.** A survey released March 1991 showed these uneven reforms in teacher education for 1990 (with 1987 comparisons): 93 percent of 200 heads of teacher education schools, colleges, or departments (25 percent, deans) surveyed said they had raised admission standards (73 percent, 1987); 75 percent had raised exit standards, mainly because of state legislative requirements (55 percent, 1987); 73 percent had formed partnerships with elementary and secondary schools to improve teacher education (51 percent, 1987); 51 percent had reformed their liberal arts curriculum (52 percent, 1987); and 36 percent had used incentives to recruit superior students (49 percent, 1987).[16]

Most teacher education reforms resulted from such external requirements as state department of education directives. Of the 200 heads of education departments surveyed, 85 percent were male and 95 percent were white. Most had been in their present positions for 5 years and anticipated remaining there another 4 or 5 years (in a an earlier survey they had anticipated remaining 15 years). Most of the deans (25 percent of the 200) had been in higher education for about 20 years, and 88 percent had been school administrators sometime in their careers. Deans earned an average of $64,000 for 12 months (chairpersons, $55,000). The relatively few women heads of education schools earned 90 percent as much as their male counterparts (up from 81 percent, 1985). Despite frustrations, 86 percent of deans and 69 percent of chairpersons said they would accept their administrative posts again.[17]

**Goodlad's Teacher Education Reform: 8 Centers of Pedagogy.** Eight pilot U.S. Centers of Pedagogy were established in 1991 to carry out John I. Goodlad's ambitious teacher education reform, suggested in his three 1990 books, especially Teachers for Our Nation's Schools.[18] Goodlad, education professor and director, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, has since 1985 investigated, and through his books described, poor teacher education conditions at 29 public and

private higher education institutions in 8 states that employ 25 percent of all U.S. elementary and secondary school teachers. Besides a disturbing turnover of higher education leaders responsible for teacher education, he found that schools of education lack coherence, make little effort to recruit students, have no clear entry point, have too few minority students, and emphasize "practical" teacher education while neglecting the "moral" aspects of preventing dropouts.

The 8 pilot Centers of Pedagogy, linchpin of Goodlad's teacher education reform strategy, are places where arts, sciences, and teacher education faculties collaborate with public schools teachers and administrators--all from nearby institutions--to produce the best possible teachers. The centers, each with its own faculty and budget, comprise Goodlad's vision of how to elevate teacher education to the status and autonomy of law schools or medical schools. The 8 pilot Centers of Pedagogy, each with a particular strength, are California Polytechnic State University, focusing on how to recruit minority teachers; Miami University in Ohio; Montclair State College in New Jersey, offering an urban setting; Texas A & M University; University of Washington, Goodlad's own institution; Wheelock College in Boston, committed to educating teachers in a small setting; University of Wyoming; and a consortium of South Carolina institutions.

Teacher education procedures to be overhauled at the 8 pilot Centers of Pedagogy includes a university-school collaboration (with many schools, not just one "lab school"). Placing individual student teachers with cooperating teachers in public schools will give way to groups of student teachers instructed by composite faculties from public schools, university colleges of education, and university arts and sciences departments. Each of the 8 centers has been funded for 5 years by the Exxon Education Foundation. Working with these centers are the Education Commission of the States, which will aid communication among the sites and help make state governments more open to teacher education reform; and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, whose members will spread information about center-oriented teacher education reform projects and progress.

At an October 1991 meeting in Seattle, Washington, Center of Pedagogy representatives pondered how to prod change in often intransigent school districts and academia; how to recruit and support

minority teachers; how to raise teacher education prestige in a society that undervalues women who dominate teaching; how to make teacher education admissions more qualitative; how to change the reward system so that professors will work with schools, wrongly perceived as low-status work, without feeling they are jeopardizing prestigious research grants; how to get state funding and acceptance of the school-university hybrid-like Centers; how to get school superintendents to understand, benefit from, and support university-school partnership; and how to overcome teacher union opposition to "more time with no more pay" for cooperating public school teachers. The project is fraught with problems and opportunities, says Goodlad. He is optimistic and was encouraged enough to create a followup Agenda for Teacher Education in a Democracy project. The project comes from Goodlad's central thesis (in The Moral Dimension of Teaching), that preparing teachers for children in a political democracy is a moral responsibility. Recent education reform has been driven by an economic motive, to prepare young people for jobs and to advance the U.S. economy. One educator said, "Goodlad has emphasized...that teaching and teacher education is a moral concern; it involves moral imperatives."[19]

**Holmes Group's Professional Development Schools Compared with Goodlad's Centers of Pedagogy**. Also involved in teacher education reform is the Holmes Group, a consortium of 96 deans of education at elite U.S. research universities. Before 1990 its major influence was to require a minimum fifth year for preparing teachers (an arts or science bachelor degree plus an M.A. degree in education). Then on April 15, 1990, the Holmes Group published Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools.[20] PDSchools, similar to but described a year before Goodlad's Centers of Pedagogy, are sites in selected elementary and secondary schools where university arts and science professors and education professors work with teachers and school administrators to design curriculum, conduct research, train new teachers, and upgrade experienced teachers. The PDSchools model is the teaching hospital where medical student interns (i.e., teacher education students) learn their skills helping to heal patients (i.e., public school students) under medical school faculty supervision (i.e., university subject matter professors and education professors cooperating with public school teachers and administrators). The PDSchools idea is to integrate theory

and practice and to initiate research that furthers curriculum development and aids teaching techniques.

Frank Murray, University of Delaware's education dean and a Holmes Group leader, compared the Holmes Group's Tomorrow's Schools with Goodlad's Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. Goodlad listed 19 conditions necessary for effective teacher education and found them largely absent in the 29 institutions his team investigated. The Holmes Group's Tomorrow's Schools anticipated and advocated most of Goodlad's 19 conditions, so that a similarly skilled teacher would likely result from either the Goodlad or the Holmes teacher education reform programs. The Holmes agenda stressed teachers' cognitive and intellectual skills while Goodlad emphasized teachers' values. The heart of Goodlad's recommendation, says Murray, is largely administrative; that is, a new teacher education unit called a Center of Pedagogy, with budget autonomy and power to name arts, sciences, and education professors, and public school teachers and administrators--all to collaborate on improving teacher education. Like others, Murray admires Goodlad's concern for the moral dimension of teaching. He also likes Goodlad's observation that low-cost teacher education is an illusion. Since only half of teacher education graduates go into teaching and half of these leave within five years, it costs just as much to produce one lifelong teacher as it does to train a physician.

In 1991 a Holmes Center for Faculty Leadership and Renewal was established at Ohio State University to promote teacher education reform ideas and as a meeting place for Holmes scholars.[21]

As education reform pressures mount, so too will demand for improving teacher education.

References


1. 1991 Back-To-School Forecast, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, August 28, 1991.
2. Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis, Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.
3. Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 9 (October 30, 1991), p. 4; Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 38, No. 11 (November 6, 1991), p. A42.
4. Arthur E. Wise and Linda Darling-Hammond, "Alternative Certification is an Oxymoron," Education Week, Vol 11, No. 1 (September 4, 1991), pp. 56, 46.

5. Martin Haberman, "Catching Up With Reform in Teacher Education," Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 10 (November 6, 1991), pp. 36, 29.
6. Millicent Lawton, "Teach for America: Salvation or Disservice?" Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 40 (July 31, 1991), pp. 1, 26, 27.
7. James P. Steffensen, "The Privatization of Teacher Education," Education Week, Vol 10, No. 19 (January 30, 1991), p. 40; Kopp's rejoinder, Vol. 10, No. 24 (March 6, 1991), pp. 29, 31; and Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 37, No. 40 (June 19, 1991), pp. A21-A22.
8. Andrew L. Yarrow, "New York Budget Cuts Imperil Teacher Corps," New York Times (January 19, 1991), p. 15.
9. Susan Chira, "For Freshman Teacher Corps, A Sobering Year," New York Times (June 26, 1991), pp. A1, B7; Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 37, No. 48 (August 14, 1991), p. B4; Wendy Kopp, "Replace Certification With Recruitment," Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 6 (October 9, 1991), p. 33; and Beth Matter, "Teaching for America: Graduates Tackle Toughest Classroom Around," Vanderbilt Magazine, Vol. 75, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 11-12.
10. Julie A. Miller, "Conferees Rack Measure to Free Funds for Board," Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 27 (March 27, 1991), p. 25; and Julie A. Miller and Karen Diegmueller, "Bush Shifts Scene on Federal Aid to Teacher Board," Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 40 (July 31, 1991), pp. 1, 22.
11. NEA Today, Vol. 10, No. 3 (October 1991), pp. 27, 30.
12. Ann Bradley, "Standards Board Awards 3 Contracts to Develop Teacher Assessments," Education Week, Vol 10, No. 24 (March 6, 1991), p. 5; "University of Ga. Wins Contract for Teaching Tests," Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 25 (March 13, 1991), p. 11; and Kathleen Ambrogi, "Teacher Certification: Challenge for the '90s," NewsLinks, Vol. 11, No. 1 (September 1991), pp. 1-6.
13. Karen Diegmueller, "NCATE To Join Fla. Agencies To Review Programs," Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 6 (October 9, 1991), pp. 1, 21.
14. Karen Diegmueller, "West Va. Board Agrees to Scrap NCATE Mandate," Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 4 (December 4, 1991), pp. 1, 15; and Karen Diegmueller, "Higher Percentage of Schools Pass Latest Round of NCATE Review," Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 39 (June 19, 1991), p. 15.

15. Characteristics of Stayers, Movers, and Leavers. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.).
16. "Teacher-Education Reforms," Education Week, Vol 10, No. 26 (March 20, 1991), p. 7.
17. Karen Diegmueller, "Teacher-Education Reform Slow, Deans Say in Study," Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 25 (March 13, 1991), p. 9.
18. With Roger Soder and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, which also published in 1990, by the same authors, Places Where Teachers Are Taught and The Moral Dimension of Teaching).
19. Ann Bradley, "Teacher Educators Signing on to 'Movement' To Implement Goodlad's Proposals for Reform," Education Week, Vol. 10, No. 34 (May 15, 1991), p. 6; and Millicent Lawton, "Led by Goodlad, Eight Sites Set To Transform Teacher Training," Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 1 (September 4, 1991), p. 18.
20. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
21. Ann Bradley, "Holmes Board Approves Center to Coach Teacher Educators," Education Week, Vol 10, No. 20 (February 6, 1991), p. 5; Education Week, Vol. 11, No. 14 (December 4, 1991), p. 6; and "Frank Murray Appraises the New Goodlad Book," Holmes Group Forum, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Winter 1991), p. 29.